

JUN. 20. 2006 11:42AM

HARRINGTON & SMITH

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NO. 034 P. 1/2

JUN 20 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/091,206 Confirmation No.: 6322  
Applicant(s): Bantz et al.  
Filed: 3/4/2002  
Art Unit: 2136  
Examiner: Cervetti, David Garcia  
Title: Decryption System For Encrypted  
Attorney Docket No.: 909L.0056.USU  
Customer No.: 29,683

Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response To Advisory Action

Sir:

This is in response to the Advisory Action mailed 06/20/2006 in regard to the above-identified patent application.

The examiner stated that he could not determine where in the office action it is stated that "controlling/authenticating access to resources by using FOBs, encryption, and decryption was conventional and well known". The examiner's attention is directed to page 3, lines 3-5 of the office action dated 01/17/2006.

The examiner stated that the features of claims 3, 8, 13, 16 and 17 are taken by the examiner to be admitted prior art since the applicant has not adequately challenged the examiner's use of office notice. This is incorrect. Applicants' attorney hereby challenges all of the examiner's "official notice". The features recited in claims 3, 8, 13, 16 and 17 are not well known in the art of "an encrypted audio